

Serial No. 10/692,634  
Response dated November 28, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CS21907RA

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 24 remain in this application. Claims 1, 7, 13, 17, 19 through 21, and 23 have been amended.

Applicants thank the Examiner for identifying the typographical error in claim 21, and claim 21 is hereby amended accordingly. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 21 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. US 6,885,874 B2 to Grube, et al. ("Grube, et al. patent").

Claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event, the data being obtained by at least one video sensor of the at least one remote device. Claim 7 as amended provides, *inter alia*, recording data relating to the subject matter of the incident event, the data being obtained by at least one video sensor. Claim 13 as amended provides, *inter alia*, receiving, from a remote device, incident information associated with an incident event, the incident information having been obtained by at least one video sensor of the remote device. Claim 17 as amended provides, *inter alia*, a first wireless communication device including a first short-range transceiver to transmit a request signal and a first video sensor to collect data relating to an incident event in response to a user activation input; and a second wireless communication device including a second short-range transceiver to receive the request signal and a second video sensor to collect data relating to the incident event in response to the

Serial No. 10/692,634  
Response dated November 28, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CS21907RA

request signal. Thus, the data associated with the incident is obtained by a video sensor capable of obtaining visual information, such as static images, dynamic video, or a multimedia combination. Support for the above recitation is provided at page 11, lines 22 and 23; page 15, 19 through 22; and page 17, lines 17 through 22, of the specification.

In contrast, the Grube, et al. patent describes a location sensor and associated components for determining the location of a communication unit, and a transceiver to communicate location information with the GLSS controller. The Grube, et al. patent does not describe or suggest handling of the data associated with the incident is obtained by a video sensor, as required by amended claims 1, 7, 13 and 17. Therefore, claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 distinguish patentably from the Grube, et al. patent.

Claims 2 through 6, 8 through 12, 14 through 16, and 18 through 24 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 17. Therefore, claims 2 through 6, 8 through 12, 14 through 16, and 18 through 24 distinguish patentably from the Grube, et al. patent for the reasons stated above for independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 17.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1 through 24 are respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope

Serial No. 10/692,634  
Response dated November 28, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 26, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CS21907RA


of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brown, Daniel P., et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:  
Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department (HDW)  
600 North US Highway 45, AS437  
Libertyville, IL 60048

  
Hisashi D. Watanabe  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 37,465  
Telephone: (847) 523-2322  
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350

11/28/05  
Date